DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 240 416 CG 017 245

AUTHOR O'Loughlin, Dan
TITLE Gathering and Using External Feedback: Graduate Perspectives.
INSTITUTION Texas Univ., Austin.
PUB DATE 25 Aug 83
NOTE 23p.; Paper presented at the Annual Convention of the American Psychological Association (91st, Anaheim, CA, August 26-30, 1983).
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS College Graduates; Counselor Educators; Counselor Role; *Counselor Training; *Doctoral Programs; Feedback; *Program Effectiveness; Program Evaluation; Program Improvement; *Psychologists
IDENTIFIERS *Counseling Psychology; Professional Activities; *University of Texas Austin

ABSTRACT

For a counseling psychology training program to be effective, it must keep up with current trends and developments in the field. To evaluate the Counseling Psychology Training Program (CPTP) at the University of Texas at Austin, 74 doctoral level graduates of the program within the decade of 1973-1982 (51 males, 23 females) completed a questionnaire designed to gather information on demographics, current professional activities, and program evaluation, i.e., graduates' ratings of the CPTP. An analysis of the results showed that the CPTP strengths were the overall quality of the faculty and of the training both in psychotherapy and research, helpful atmosphere, and program flexibility. Weaknesses were the limited focus of the training, limited and late scheduled practica, and a few uninterested faculty. All graduates reported strong support of professional organizations and no difficulty in attaining licensure. All but one respondent were employed in a counseling or clinical psychology setting. Specific recommendations to the program were threefold. First, the program goals and orientation should be reevaluated since a lack of clarity and some dissatisfaction among graduates about the direction and purpose of training was found. Second, students should be provided with more information concerning career options. Finally, the program should consider the issue of counseling psychology identity. A liaison committee between the faculty, students, and graduates was developed to assist in the implementation of the recommendations. (BL)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED240416

Gathering and Using External Feedback: Graduate Perspectives

Dan O'Loughlin

The University of Texas at Austin

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Dan O'Loughlin

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

CG 017245

Paper presented at the American Psychological Convention in Anaheim, California on August 25, 1983.

Introduction

One important aspect of maintaining an effective counseling psychology training program is keeping abreast of current trends and developments in the field. For those of us involved in the training of counseling psychologists, either as program directors, faculty members or even graduate students, we all are quite familiar with the demands inherent in such a task. However, thanks to the contributions of a dedicated few, we are kept relatively well informed of issues of concern. For example, a brief examination of articles dealing with training in counseling psychology reveals investigation in areas of professional identity (Goldschmitt, 1981; Hamilton, 1977), curriculum and theoretical orientation (Halpin, 1978), role functions (Tipton, 1982), and job placement (Banikiotes, 1977; Banikiotes, 1980) just to name a few. Notwithstanding the importance of the contributions made to date, it seems an appropriate time to turn our interest and attention inward. That is to say, since we now have acquired a considerable data base from current students and graduates across many different counseling psychology training programs, perhaps it is time to look <u>within</u>, at our own particular training program.

The purpose of this paper is to describe how The University of Texas at Austin's Counseling Psychology Training Program used relevant data gathered from a survey of its graduates to evaluate and propose modification in existing program goals and procedures. Today, I would like to present to you some key results from the graduate survey, recommendations made to the CPTP Executive Committee based on the information gathered, and proposed strategies to increase graduates' involvement in auxillary education of current students in the program.

Method

A questionnaire was developed to gather relevant information from recent graduates of The University of Texas at Austin Counseling Psychology Training Program (CPTP). A draft of the questionnaire was distributed to the counseling faculty and twenty program graduates soliciting their impressions and recommendations for revisions. The final questionnaire consisted of sixty items designed to gather information in the following areas: Demographic: age, sex, date entered the program, date received the Ph.D. degree, and previous degrees and work experiences; Current Professional Activities: primary work setting, % time spent per week in professional activity areas, primary professional role, professional identity, organizational affiliations, and state licensure status; Program Evaluation: graduates' ratings of CPTP organizational issues, degree requirements, curriculum, preparation for present professional work, student/student and student/faculty relations, stressors, and general satisfaction with training.

The population to be surveyed was defined as the graduates of the CPTP who had received the Ph.D. degree within the last 10 years (1973-1982). A questionnaire was sent to each of the 115 graduates (80 male, 35 female) with a cover letter from the program director, Dr. June Gallessich. Also, a self-addressed, stamped envelope was provided each graudate.

Initially, sixty-two graduates returned the survey. A follow-up letter and another survey was sent to each graduate who had not identified themselves by including their name on a returned survey. An additional twelve surveys were returned before the designated deadline.

Thus, a total of 74 graduates made up the sample population which constitutes a return rate of 64%.

Results

Demographics

Of the 74 graduates in the study, 51 (69%) are male and 23 (31%) are female, which corresponds highly to the 2-1 male-to-female ratio in the population. Ninety-one percent of the repondents chose to include their name and current work address on the questionnaire. The mean age was 37 years ranging from 29 to 58. The average year for entering the program was 1972 (SD=2.59) and the average year for receiving the Ph.D. degree was 1977 (SD=2.18). Thirty-nine percent of the graduates entered with a master's degree, of which 62% were in psychology or counseling. Previous employment in a counseling related position was reported for 43% of the sample population with a range of 1 to 10 years represented.

One important aspect of the study was to identify significant differences or trends within the CPTP during the range of training years reflected in the sample population. To this end, the total sample population was sub-divided into two groups, earlier graduates and later graduates. The earlier graduates were defined as the 27 graduates who entered the program between 1968 and 1971. The later graduates were defined as the 24 graduates who entered the program between the years 1974 and 1978. Thus, the range considered was 15 years, from 1968 when the earliest graduate entered to 1982 when the earliest graduate entered to 1982 when the latest graduate received the Ph.D. degree. Since most graduates were in residence at The University of Texas from three to four years, the degree of overlap between groups is minimal.

Current Professional Activities

Primary work setting and role. Of importance to any professional training program is the employment of its' graduates following the completion of their education. The primary work settings for the graduates surveyed are presented

in Table 1.

Insert Table 1 about here

Table 1 reports the number and percentage of graduates employed in work settings previously described by Banikiotes (1977). The results find 20% of the total sample population presently employed in an academic/research setting, 42% in an organizational setting for service, and 25% in private practice. Eight percent of the graduates are employed in other settings. An encouraging note for current counseling psychology graduate students is that only one graduate was unemployed. A comparison of the present findings with a recently reported survey by the American Psychological Association (Fulcher, 1982) indicates a high relationship between employment settings for later graduates' and the APA sample of 389 1979 & 1980 counseling psychology graduates. The most noteable difference was found in the percentage of graduates engaged in private practice. Seventeen percent of the later graduates reported private practice as their primary work setting as compared to 5.7% in the APA study. Moreover, there appears to be a trend for earlier graduates to gravitate toward private practice during the course of their professional career. The fact that private practice is an attractive employment setting comes as somewhat of a surprise in that the CPTP brochure specifically discourages applications from prospective students whose primary interest is self-employment. Yet, as Kay will document for us in the next paper, the goal of a private practice is alive and flourishing among current counseling psychology students at The University of Texas at Austin.

In terms of the primary role each graduate fulfills in his/her professional work 37 (50%) reported "therapist." The remaining graduates identified their primary role as teacher 9 (12%), consultant 8 (11%), administrator 10 (14%), and other 9 (12%).

Percentage of time in activities. Another important area under investigation was the amount of time on the average graduates spent in various professional activities. Table 2 presents the percentage of time per week graduates spend in 15 professional activities. The data reveal approximately one-half of the time spent per week is devoted to treatment related activities (X=18.63). Moreover, on the average, one-fourth of their time is spent in activities involving consultation/training/administration (X=11.36). The remaining time is spent in academic/research (X=6.92) and other (X=1.74) professional activities. It should be noted that percentage of time per week in professional activities takes into account not only the graduates' primary work setting but also secondary and tertiary work settings. With regard to this, 60% of the graduates reported a secondary work setting and 23% a tertiary work setting. As might be expected private practice was by far the most often reported secondary and tertiary work setting. The results also suggest that individual therapy and administration are the activities most often engaged in during an average week's time. There was a significant difference between earlier and later graduates in terms of the amount of time spent in teaching ($P < .05$). Later graduates engaged in more time teaching than did earlier graduates. Also, two non-significant trends were found. Later graduates tneded to spend more time in in-house training than earlier graduates ($P < .13$) and earlier graduates are more involved in scholarly writing than later graduates ($P < .11$).

Insert Table 2 about here

Degree of preparation and relevance to professional work. A question of particular importance to the Counseling Psychology Training Program Executive

Committee was "How well do graduates feel they are trained in the professional activities most relevant to their current employment?" To uncover the answer to this question, each graduate was asked to respond to two questions assessing first, their degree of preparation in a professional activity and, secondly, its relevance to their current job. Ratings were reported on a 7-point Likert Scale ranging from 1 = low degree of preparation and low job relevance, respectively, to 7 = high degree of preparation and high relevance, respectively. Table 3 reports the mean and standard deviation for the total sample on 7 professional activities. Student t-tests for significance reveal that difference exist for all 7 professional activities at the $P < .001$ level. Taken at face value, the results suggest that graduates experience a significant discrepancy in terms of their preparation in these areas and its importance to their current job function. Specifically, graduates reported being underprepared in the areas of practice of psychotherapy and counseling, diagnosis, supervisory concepts and skills, teaching, consultation, and administration. Only in the area of research did the graduates report preparation that exceeded its relevance to their current job function.

Insert Table 3 about here

In terms of the degree of preparation in professional activities which were deemed highly relevant to professional work (above X=5.5) graduates reported a more favorable rating for practice of psychotherapy and counseling (X=4.82) than for diagnosis (X=3.26). Those professional activities ranked as moderately relevant (X=4 - 5.5) yielded generally less favorable ratings of degree of preparation. Here, consultation had the highest rating with a mean of 4.17, followed by teaching (X=3.48), supervisory concepts and skills (X=2.97) and administration (X=1.81). In the area of consultation, a bi-polar distribution

was noted in that the graduates who took the consultation course in the CPTP reported a high degree of preparation whereas the graduates who did not take the course reported very low degree of preparation. With regard to supervisory concepts and skills and administration it is not surprising that the mean rating was so low. Currently, neither area is offered within the Department of Educational Psychology. However, due to their reported relevance to graduate employment, current students should be encouraged to secure training by taking courses from other graduate school departments at The University of Texas. Finally, no significant difference existed between earlier and later graduates for either degree of preparation or relevance to current job function. However, a non-significant trend does suggest that later graduates reported a higher degree of preparation in diagnosis than did earlier graduates.

Before discussing issues related to program evaluation, I would like to briefly present a few characteristics of the CPTP graduates which seem to be of particular interest to the present status of the field of counseling psychology. Here I refer to the issues of professional identity, organizational affiliation, and of state licensure.

Numerous articles in recent years have implied that the field of counseling psychology experiences an identity crises (Goldschmidt, 1981; Hamilton, 1977; Tipton, 1982). The relative youth and rapid growth of the profession have contributed greatly to the identity problem. One particular area of interest has been the growing similarity between counseling and clinical psychology. The data gathered in this study certainly documents the existence of a lack of boundary clarity between the two fields. Whilte 47% of the sample population identified themselves as counseling psychologists, a surprisingly large percentage of graduates (38%) viewed themselves as clinical psychologists.

Interestingly, these percentages are strikingly similar to percentages reported for current graduate students of the CPTP, as will be dis.ussed by Kay in the next paper. Further examination of the data revealed a strong relationship between professional identity and primary work setting (P= <.002). Graduates employed in academic jobs (teaching or university counseling centers) overwhelmingly identified themselves as counseling psychologists whereas graduates in community mental health centers and outpatient clinics strongly identified themselves as clinical psychologists. Graduates in private practice reported a 2-1 ratio of counseling to clinical psychology identification. Moreover, the primary role of graduates is related to professional identity at the P= <.005 level of significance. Here, graduates whose primary role is that of teacher are unanimously identified to counseling psychology whereas consultants and administrators are strongly identified to clinical psychology. The graduates whose primary role is therapist were evenly split between counseling and clinical psychology. Certainly the findings from the study will spawn interest in taking a closer look at the issue of counseling psychology identity in the CPTP.

In terms of professional organizational affiliation and licensure, CPTP graduates are strongly supportive of the American Psychological Association (APA) and experienced little difficulty in being licensed as psychologists. Eighty-nine percent of the sample population reported membership in APA. Forty graduates indicated they are members of at least one APA division and 23 (58%) reported membership in Division 17. Moreover, a total of 59 different professional organizations were cited by graduates as important to their professional work, and no single organization was mentioned more than twice. This finding certainly speaks to the diversity of interests of graduates from the CPTP.

With regard to state licensure, 66 (89%) graduates reported they are a licensed psychologist in at least one state. Nineteen states are represented in the sample. Moreover, 83% indicated no difficulty in acquiring licensure.

Program Evaluation

Organizational issues. This portion of the survey requested each graduate to respond to a series of questions regarding the organizational aspects of the CPTP. On a 7-point Likert Scale each graduate rated his/her overall evaluation of the counseling curriculum. The graduates responded in a favorable direction with a mean score of 4.74. A similar rating was noted for the graduates assessment of the quality of required courses in the CPTP (X=4.75). With regard to the clarity of goals of the CPTP, graduates experessed a, neutral position (X-3.96) between "not at all clear" and "very clear." A less favorable rating was given in regard to the graduates being provided with information concerning career options, planning and decision making in counseling psychology (X=2.90). In addition, graduates had a moderately low rating of the extent to which the CPTP kept them abreast of professional developments and issues (X=3.74) and the extent to which they were individually advised by counseling faculty as to career goals and appropriate courses, practica, and internships available to them (X=3.49). The results suggest that the graduates in general are most favorable in their evaluation of the academic curriculum and required courses and least favorable of the information provided by the program concerning career options, planning, and decision-making.

Strengths and weaknesses. To assess program strengths and weaknesses, the graduates were asked to list the four features of the CPTP which they considered to be strengths and four features they considered weaknesses in rank order of importance. Tables 4 and 5 report a summary of the most frequent

responses listed by the graduates as the primary strength and weakness. The largest percentage of responses concerned the faculty in terms of their overall quality, their accessability to and attitude towards students, and the quality of the courses they taught. Other strengths include training in psychotherapy, non-competative atmosphere of the program and eclectic orientation of the program. The two most frequently mentioned weaknesses of the program were a lack of training in a specific area which most often referred to a particular therapy orientation, and non-productive or disinterested faculty members. It should be noted that the latter responses made mention of one or two faculty members repeatedly, neither of whom are associated with the counseling program at the present time. The two remaining weaknesses were identified as practica and the eclectic orientation of the program. Practica was singled out primarily because of the feeling that the experiential training component came too late in the program (typically beginning in the 2nd or 3rd year), practica sites were not diverse enough, the program required too few practica of its students and/or on-site supervision was poor. While some graduates listed the eclectic orientation of the program as a strength, others regarded it as a primary weakness. For these graduates, the program's lack of a central theoretical orientation, focus or direction was regarded as a weakness.

Environmental aspects. Another area of interest to the CPTP Executive Committee was the level of student satisfaction with the various environmental aspects of the CPTP. Graduates reported a low degree of competition among counseling students ($\bar{X}$=3.00) and a very high degree of satisfaction with the quality of interpersonal relationships they had with fellow graduate students ($\bar{X}$=5.80). Interestingly, there was a non-significant trend (P= <.13) suggesting that later graduates perceive more competition among students than did earlier

graduates. Also, significant difference ($P < .005$) was revealed indicating later graduates were less satisfaction with the quality of relationships they had with other graduate students. The relationship between students and faculty is an important variable in determining graduates overall satisfaction with training (Halpin, 1978). In this study, the graduates gave a favorable rating to satisfaction with the quality of interpersonal relationships they had with counseling faculty members ($X=4.53$). Moreover, approximately 75% of the graduates reported having had a mentor relationship with an Educational Psychology Department faculty member, of which 90% were from the counseling psychology faculty. While there seems to be a reasonably good connection between students and faculty, graduates gave a moderate rating to the degree of CPTP promoted interpersonal interactions between students and faculty ($X=3.93$). A significant difference existed between groups in that the earlier graduates perceived the program to promote interactions more so than did the later graduates ($P < .10$). The results indicate that there have been significant changes in the atmosphere of the program with respect to competition among students, satisfaction of student/student relationships, and degree to which the program promotes interpersonal interactions between students and faculty.

Stressors. Many psychology graduate students agree that stress is a natural byproduct of graduate school life (Goplerud, 1980). However, graduates of the CPTP as a whole reported only a moderate level of stress during their graduate years ($X=4.14$, $SD=1.64$). Graduates listed primary sources of stress as interpersonal (22%), research (20%), marital (17%), financial (10%), professional (9%), and academic (7%). The high level of stress associated with research is understandable in light of the fact that the successful completion of a research proposal is a prerequisite to admission to doctoral candidacy.

While graduates report that writing a research proposal was a valuable learning experience, there was mixed opinion as to its utility as a criterion for admission to candidacy. Most recently, alternative modes of evaluating student's admission to candidacy were discussed at a student-faculty retreat and the results will be presented to the Chairman of the Educational Psychology Department this fall. In addition, other avenues are being explored to reduce the felt level of stress among current graduate students. As Sue has already mentioned, the New Student Orientation Program was implemented to reduce the stressful effects of beginning graduate training which is frequently cited by incoming students. Also, the University of Texas Counseling Center has responded to counseling students' request for an ongoing group to provide a setting for exploring issues of personal growth and development. Both student initiated programs have been successful in meeting the goal of assisting students in dealing with stress associated with being a Ph.D. student in the counseling psychology training program.

General satisfaction and willingness to participate. Finally, graduates were asked to assess their general level of satisfaction with training, how they would compare their training to other professionals in their field, whether or not they would recommend the CPTP to a prospective student, and are they willing to participate in the auxillary training of current Ph.D. counseling psychology students. The graduates reported a general satisfaction with the training they received ($\bar{X}$=4.82, SD=1.48), and an even higher rating when comparing it to the training of other professionals in their field ($\bar{X}$=5.11, SD=1.39). Later graduates differed significantly from earlier graduates in rating their training in comparison to others ($P < .10$). Perhaps the most valid

indicator of graduates' satisfaction with their training they received at The University of Texas at Austin Counseling Psychology Training Program can be found in the level at which they would recommend it to a prospective student. Here, 47% responded that they would "definitely recommend" the CPTP, 29% said they would "recommend" it, 22% said "with reservations," and 1% said "no" and 1% "definitely no." Last but not least, 67% of the graduates indicated they would be willing to participate in auxiliary education of current students through on-campus presentations, contribution to a newletter, communication about job opportunities and relocation to their geographic region of the country. The willingness of graduate to become involved in training opens up an important and previously untapped resource for the CPTP.

Discussion

Because of the participation of the 74 graduates, who generously took the time to fill out the rather lengthy questionnaire, I am able to summarize the results and make a few general recommendations.

1. Overall, the graduates were satisfied with the quality of training they received from the Counseling Psychology Training Program. The strongest indicator of satisfaction with training might be interpreted by the fact that 76% of the graduates would recommend the program to a prospective student without reservation.

2. The level of stress experienced by graduates during training was reported as moderate. Primary sources of stress were: intrapersonal, research, marital, financial, professional and academic.

3. Environmental aspects of the program seem to have changed during the 15 years training span represented by the sample population. Specifically, later graduates report less satisfaction in their relationships with students

and less promotion by the program of interpersonal interactions between students and faculty. However, numerous times throughout the survey graduates cited the non-competative, helpful atmosphere of the program as a primary strength.

4. The faculty was regarded as a primary strength of the program. Specifically, graduates cited the faculty's overall quality, accessability to students, attitude toward students and quality of instruction. Other strengths were the training in psychotherapy and the eclectic orientation of the program.

5. Weaknesses were identified as non-productive, disinterested faculty, practica, and the lack of a central theoretical oreintation of the program.

6. Students responded neutrally with regard to the clarity of goals of the CPTP.

7. Graduates were generally dissatisfied with the degree of information they received concerning career options, planning, and decision-making in counseling psychology. Also, they rated moderately low the extent to which they were individually advised of career goals and appropriate courses, practica, and internships available to them.

8. Graduates indicate a strong support of the American Psychological Association and a wide diversity of interests in other professional organizations.

9. Graduates reported little difficulty in being granted state licensure as a psychologist.

10. Graduates employed in academic positions and unversity counseling centers identified strongly with counseling psychology as did graduates whose primary role was "teacher."

11. Graduates employed in community mental health centers and outpatient clinics were strongly associated with clinical psychology, as were the primary roles of consultant and administrator.

12. Forty-seven percent of the sample identified themselves as counseling psychologists and 38% as clinical psychologists.

13. Professional activities of moderate relevance to current job functioning were rated low in terms of preparation received from the CPTP. These activities were: teaching, supervisory concepts and skills, and administration.

14. Professional activities of high relevance were diagnosis and practice of psychotherapy and counseling which received low and moderately high ratings, respectively.

15. A significant difference existed between the 7 professional activities deemed relevant to professional work and the degree of preparation received in them as a student.

16. Treatment related activities occupy 50% of the graduates' time in a given week. Individual therapy and administration are the most frequently performed activities.

17. Private practice is the primary work setting of a large number of the graduates and the most frequently identified secondary and tertiary work setting.

Specific recommendation to the Executive Committee are threefold. First, the data suggest that the program goals and orientation should be re-evaluated. There exists a lack of clarity and some dissatisfaction among graduates as to the direction and purpose of training. Secondly, students are in need of more information concerning career options and appropriate steps to achieve their goals as they progress through the program. Finally, the program should consider the issue of counseling psychology identity. Numerous indicators suggest that graduates were not aware as students of the developments and trends in the field.

At this time, the extent of graduate involvement in the CPTP has been limited to their participation in supplying very useful data about the training they received. It is our hope that for the majority of graduates their involvement does not end here. Finally, a few suggestions regarding how graduates might best be used to facilitate the training of current students.

1) A liason committee composed of interested students and faculty members could be established to coordinate contact with graduates and assist in the planning of auxillary eduational training activities.

2) The committee could compile relevant demographic and professional activity information on each graduate and place it on file for current students to brows through and pursue individual contact on their own.

3) Graduates expressing an interest in on-campus presentations could easily be integrated into the present "brown bag seminars" on Firdays at noon to discuss informally with graduate students such topics as career options, professional development and current trends in the field, etc. Moreover, formal presentations such as a panal discussion could be arranged to generate interaction among graduates themselves and, of course students and aculty.

4) Graduates could become involved also through expansion of the current Counseling Psychology Newsletter. A section reporting communication with graduates, and even articles submitted by graduates might generate interest and participation in the program.

5) The bottom line is that graduates of the University of Texas at Austin' Counseling Psychology Training Program are interested in the CPTP and willing to become more involved given a little direction and encouragement. The only limitation of graduate participation might very well be the number of ways in which we can come up with to involve them.

Table 1

Primary Work Setting

Setting	Earlier Graduates N	%	Later Graduates N	%	All Graduates N	%
Academic/Research	4	22%	4	17%	15	20%
University Psychology Department	3	11%	3	11%	12	16%
Medical School			1	4%	2	3%
Research Organization	1	4%			1	1%
Organization Setting-Service	11	40%	12	51%	31	42%
University Counseling Center	3	11%	6	26%	10	14%
Mental Hospital	2	7%	1	4%	4	5%
General Hsopital			1	4%	3	4%
Community Mental Health Center			3	13%	6	8%
Outpatient Clinic	6	22%	1	4%	8	11%
Private Practice	10	42%	4	17%	18	25%
Other	2	7%	3	13%	8	11%
Unemployed					1	1%
Total N	27		23		74	

Table 2

Percentage of Time Spent in Professional Activities (Hours/Week)

Activities	$\bar{X}$	SD	Rank Order
Treatment			
Individual therapy	9.64	7.84	1
Group therapy	1.50	2.70	11
Family therapy	2.41	4.74	5
Diagnosis	3.23	4.07	3
Clinical supervision	1.89	2.23	7
Academic/Research			
Teaching	3.01	4.54	4
Research	1.86	4.34	8
Research evaluation	0.32	1.13	15
Scholarly writing	1.73	3.73	9
Consultation/Training/Administration			
Community consultation	1.64	2.65	10
Business/industrial consultation	1.33	4.78	12
In-house training	2.01	4.19	6
Administration	6.34	7.50	2
Other			
Community service	1.09	1.47	13
Professional organizations	0.65	1.06	14

Note. N = 74

Table 3

Professional Activities

CPTP Preparation and Relevance to Professional Work

Activities	CPTP Preparation $\bar{X}$	SD	Relevance to Professional Work $\bar{X}$	SD
Practice of Psychotherapy and counseling	4.82	1.58	6.35	1.32*
Diagnosis	3.26	1.62	5.61	1.43*
Supervisory concepts and skills	2.97	1.87	5.26	1.82*
Teaching	3.48	1.80	4.86	1.93*
Research	5.00	1.26	3.74	2.06*
Consultation	4.17	2.29	5.28	1.59*
Administration	1.81	1.21	4.79	1.97*

Note. N = 74

* $t < .001$

TABLE 4

Primary Strengths of

The University of Texas at Austins'

Counseling Psychology Training Program

Counseling Psychology Training Program Strengths	n(%)
Quality of faculty	21(33)
Psychotherapy training	7(11)
Faculty accessability/attitude toward students	6(10)
Program atmosphere (non-competitive, helpful, positive)	6(10)
Eclectic orientation	5(8)
Quality of academic courses	5(8)
Program flexibility (individualized)	2(3)
Practica (availability, quality)	2(3)
Faculty as role models	2(3)
Research training	2(3)
Other (variety of students, faculty engaged in therapeutic service, APA accreditation, program promotes confidence as psychologist, opportunity/availability for personal growth)	5(8)
	N=63

TABLE 5

Primary Weaknesses of
The University of Texas at Austins'
Counseling Psychology Training Program

Counseling Psychology Training Program Weaknesses	n(%)
Training in a specific area (psychopathology, neurological assessment, psychoanalysis, marriage/family therapy, child/adolescent therapy, ethics)	11(19)
Non-productive, disinterested faculty	11(19)
Practica (too few, too late in training, diversity, on-site supervision)	7(12)
Eclectic Orientation (no theoretical orientation, lack of direction, focus)	6(10)
Limited range of theoretical aproaches to psychotherapy	3(5)
Limited research by Counseling faculty	3(5)
Poor student financial support	2(3)
Few women on counseling faculty	2(3)
Other (don't encourage student publication, program not intellectually rigorous enough, poor evaluation of student performance, poor therapy supervision, limited career guidance, lack of cohesion between counseling courses, poor faculty role models, faculty not engaged in therapeutic service, no real world exposure, academically oriented program, no opportunities for personal development)	13(22)
	N=58